

Q #	Date Rec'd	Question	Answer	Status
Q1	18-Sep-06	Is there an incumbent contractor for this requirement? If so, could you please provide the contractor name, contract number, value, duration, and award date. Any information which you could provide would be greatly appreciated. Thank you very much.	No, there is no incumbent contract or contractor for this particular effort.	Answer Approved
Q2	2-Oct-06	Vertical separation is said to be max. 15 feet. Is that a nominal measurement or the maximum in a seaway?	The 15 feet vertical separation is a nominal difference between the potential sending and receiving deck heights. This difference is while both platforms are at a level condition and does not take into account ship motions.	Answer Approved
Q3	2-Oct-06	Is it so that the ramp should be stowed and carried by the MLP or could it be either on the LMSR or on the MLP?	As stated in the BAA, the notional CONOPS is to have the ramp stowed on the MLP. However, the ramp should be capable of meeting the stowage requirements listed in the BAA regardless of which platform on which it is stowed..	Answer Approved
Q4	10-Oct-06	It testing with NSWCCD, can it be stated in the proposal that ONR will send money to Carderock for testing?	The use of government labs is encouraged. If the proposal calls for money to be sent directly to a government facility by ONR for Phase I, then the amount of money to be provided should be stated in the Phase I cost proposal	Answer Approved
Q5	13-Oct-06	As integrated on MLP, is it required (or desired) that the interface ramp be deployed from the port or starboard side, or both?	As stated in the BAA, the MLP is still under design; therefore the deck layout is not available and the BAA has no specific requirements. The ramp should be designed to meet the stowage requirements listed in the BAA regardless of which side it is deployed from. An MLP will not be available for phase II testing. The surrogate platform used for phase II testing may dictate which side is preferred solely for demonstration purposes.	
Q6	13-Oct-06	Would it be worthwhile to consider interface with the LMSR stern ramp as well as side-port ramp?	There are no specific requirements stated in the BAA for the ramp to interface with the LMSR side-port or stern ramp.	
Q7	13-Oct-06	How much does the current ramp technology cost?	ONR is unaware of what the "technology" cost of the current system was. For the purpose of this BAA, any proposed technologies should have reasonable expected acquisition and life cycle costs so as not to make any future acquisition of the system unaffordable.	
Q8	13-Oct-06	What is meant by "scale model"?	"Scale model" refers to sub-scale model (not full-scale) that can demonstrate the concepts proposed for the system/subsystems.	
Q9	13-Oct-06	Is the notional concept for the MLP that is given in the STLVAST RFP(N00014-06-R-0004) valid for this proposal effort?	As stated in the BAA, the MLP is still under design; therefore no specific deck layout or other information can be provided. Offerors can use the notional concept for the MLP that is given in the STLVAST RFP or may make other reasonable assumptions, however, the ramp should meet the requirements listed in the BAA and any assumptions made should be articulated.	
Q10	13-Oct-06	Can the proposal deadline be extended by two weeks?	Extension cannot be granted due to unacceptable program risk.	
Q11	16-Oct-06	Can ONR provide some notional CONOPS regarding the skin-to-skin mooring each ship's operation's during the setup and transfer?	No CONOPS are available beyond what is stated in the BAA.	
Q12	16-Oct-06	Can ONR provide dynamic envelope's of motion anticipated during transfer operations to including each ship's envelope for Heave, Pitch, Roll, Surge, Sway and Yaw?	Motions will depend on the sea conditions and will have to be calculated by the offeror. The Sea State requirements are listed in the BAA under Quantitative Performance Requirements in the BAA.	
Q13	16-Oct-06	Can ONR provide more clarification on the requirement to remove a disabled vehicle from the ramp? Does this have to be solved by equipment included in the proposed concept or can it include use of organic ship systems, such as cranes, other vehicles, etc?	As mentioned in the BAA (under <u>Additional Qualitative Requirements</u>) the proposed concept for ramp or transfer system must have the ability to remove a disabled vehicles/prime mover trailer combination/tracked vehicles in a safe and timely manner. This may be solved in a variety of ways (including use of other ship systems) but the offerors must tell us how they intend to accomplish this requirement in the proposal.	
Q14	16-Oct-06	Is the ramp required to have an equal or similar length to the LMSR ramp in it s long ramp configuration?	The proposed ramp or transfer system must meet the vertical separation, horizontal separation and maximum operable ramp angle requirements as stated in the BAA.	
Q15	16-Oct-06	Does the maximum vertical deck separation include the relative motions between the ships in the seaway?	See the answer to question number 2. The 15 feet vertical separation is a nominal difference between the potential sending and receiving deck heights. This difference is while both platforms are at a level condition and does not take into account ship motions.	
Q16	16-Oct-06	Can you provide the prime mover/trailer combination with the worst case turning radius and length to be transferred over the ramp? Can you provide the minimum turning radius onto and off of the ramp to allow for all possible combinations of vehicles? What is the maximum length of worst case prime mover/trailer combination?	The best case turning radius vehicles is the M998 HMMWV (24'-4") and the worst case is the M1074/M1076 Palletized Load System (PLS) truck and trailer combination (60'). The overall length of this combination with the towbar extended is 61.9'. However, the objective of this BAA is to maximize vehicle transfer between two ships in a seaway and extreme case turning radius should not dominate the design.	
Q17	16-Oct-06	Is there a material preference for steel, aluminum or composite?	No, there is no preference.	

Q18	16-Oct-06	Is there a preference for the ramp to be oriented longitudinally or athwartships? Are their features/capabilities on the MLP that would restrict placement/orientation of ramp?	There is no preference. However, if the proposed solution requires or lends itself better to a particular orientation, it should be stated and addressed in the proposal. As mentioned in the BAA, the MLP is still under design and therefore details on the features/capabilities of MLP are not available. Anything that can be found from open literature on the MLP program is welcome to be used in the offeror's assumptions.	
Q19	16-Oct-06	The relative motions of the two platforms have not been defined. Both for the design concept and analysis, this is very important. Does ONR expect each submitter to propose their own set of conditions and platform characteristics to analyze their concepts?	Yes. The relative motions between the two platforms will have to be calculated using software that can predict multi-body motions such as LAMP (SAIC), AQWA, MVS (CSC), etc. These motions will depend on the Sea States and loading conditions of the two vessels. Sea States are defined in the BAA. Reasonable loading conditions will have to be assumed for motion calculations.	
Q20	16-Oct-06	What are the maximum height, width and length allowances for the ramp?	The only given dimensional requirements are those provided in the BAA.	
Q21	16-Oct-06	Is there a specification for the visibility of the vehicle drivers over or through the sides of the ramp?	There are no known visibility requirements over or through the sides of the ramp.	
Q22	16-Oct-06	Please clarify the requirement regarding the 500psf contact pressure for the Ramp Foot to Ship/Pier: What is the driver for this requirement (local/global structural allowances)? Does this include application of the maximum vehicle load to the foot of the ramp?	The 500psf number is based on the floor loading of the M1A2 tank, the maximum vehicle load on the foot of the ramp. The floor loading of the M1A2 at 140,000lbs is 448psf	
Q23	16-Oct-06	Is the motion compensation system expected to actively compensate the ramp foot loading where ship motions and vehicle loadings create the potential for greater than the 500 psf loading?	The motion compensation system is not a must. If the requirements stated in the BAA can be met without the motion compensation system, then that is acceptable. The motion compensation system was envisioned to reduce rolling and torsional motions of the ramp and also to minimize force transfer between the two ships and from the ramp/transfer system to each ship.	
Q24	16-Oct-06	Is there an overall ramp deflection criteria? This includes all modes of deflection - bending and torsion	No. However, the ramp should be able to safely operate and transfer vehicles in the deflected shape.	
Q25	16-Oct-06	For Phase II full scale testing, will ONR provide the test platforms and vehicles, installation of ramp systems and required ship services (i.e.. Electricity, structural foundations, chilled water, etc), ship/ramp/vehicle crew for performance of In-port and At-sea testing?	No. In kind contributions from other Navy sponsors may be obtained.	
Q26	16-Oct-06	Can ONR expand on expectations of Phase I scale model testing?	Phase I scale model testing refers to sub-scale models (not full-scale) that can demonstrate the concepts proposed for the system/subsystems to support down-select for phase II award.	
Q27	16-Oct-06	Has ONR contacted the State Department regarding ITAR regulations with this BAA? ONR has made the BAA publicly available and is inviting foreign participation in the effort. The only limitation being the full scale prototype must be built in the US. Can ONR provide any leverage on getting pre-contract award approvals of teaming TAAs? What process will ONR use to track, review and approve proposed TAAs?	ONR has not contacted the State Department regarding ITAR regulations. It will be Offeror's responsibility to adhere to ITAR regulations. ONR may be able to expedite the ITAR process once it has been initiated by the offeror.	
Q28	16-Oct-06	Does ONR have any reference ABS or Coast Guard Safety specifications that would be the starting point for defining System Safety and Operational Manning Safety requirements associated with the IRT?	No. Offerors may contact ABS directly regarding System Safety and Operational Manning Safety.	
Q29	16-Oct-06	ONR briefly mentioned that Navy doctrinal "Dynamic Positioning" may increase the required horizontal (side by side) separation distance between ships. Can you explain this further?	The ramp/transfer system should meet the separation requirements stated in the BAA. As this is a dynamic process and the future requirements may change, the science and technology proposed should be able to adapt to changes in the separation distance requirements due to use of Dynamic Positioning or other approaches.	
Q30	16-Oct-06	Enhanced traction - Does ONR know the specifications used to establish the 12 degree maximum ramp inclination/declination?	The 12 degree limit on the absolute ramp angle (i.e. the angle of the ramp roadway relative to true horizontal) is driven by the experience of vehicle traction especially when the ramp is subjected to wetness and icing. If a capability of greater than 12 degrees is proposed, the offeror must address how the traction issue is solved.	
Q31	16-Oct-06	Can you clarify whether you plan to award multiple (1 or more) Phase I awards for up to \$2M each OR multiple (1 or more) Phase I awards totaling \$2M?	As stated in the BAA, Phase I is anticipated to last up to 2 years at a value of about \$2M for <u>each award</u> .	
Q32	16-Oct-06	Can you provide the NSWC POC for the modeling and simulation study that you are sponsoring and POC's for each of the codes listed?	POC for M&S study is Andrew Silver Code 5500 Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Bethesda, MD 20817 (301) 227-5119 (301) 227-5442 (fax) andrew.silver@navy.mil	